

Dec. 31, 2013.) Rather, the Court's authority in this case is limited to the enforcement and implementation of the Consent Order and subsequent orders entered by the Court. United States v. Dist. Council of New York City, 972 F. Supp. 756, 763 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) ("In the case at bar, the Court is concerned only with the proper implementation of the Consent Decree."). (See Stip. & Order ¶ 12(g).) Neither the Consent Order nor the Stipulation and Order implicates actions taken by the UBC or the interpretation of its constitution by UBC officers. United States v. Dist. Council of New York City, 972 F. Supp. 756, 760-61 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) ("The Consent Decree says nothing about the UBC's powers to act under its constitution, by-laws, and the Federal labor laws; nor was there a basis in law for doing so."); U.S. v. District Council of New York City, No. 90 Civ. 5722, 2007 WL 2728984, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Sep. 12, 2007) ("This Court's limited jurisdiction does not extend to adjudicating alleged violations of the UBC Constitution."). (See Stip. & Order ¶ 2 ("The Court has authority to enter this Stipulation and Order pursuant to its inherent power, including the inherent power to enforce, ensure compliance with, and modify the Consent Decree.").)

Dated: New York, New York
January 8, 2014



RICHARD M. BERMAN, U.S.D.J.